



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,803	06/24/2003	Paul O'Conner	ACH 2946 US	1100

7590

04/21/2005

LOUIS A. MORRIS
AKZO NOBEL INC.
7 LIVINGSTONE AVENUE
DOBBS FERRY, NY 10522-3408

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, CHRISTINA ANN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/602,803

Applicant(s)

O'CONNER ET AL.

Examiner

Christina Johnson

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-22, drawn to a cationic layered material and a process of preparing such, classified in class 502, subclass 80.
 - II. Claims 23-27, drawn to a hydrocarbon conversion process, classified in class 585, subclass 100+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of use such as a catalyst for the reduction of nitrogen oxides.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1725

5. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Louis Morris on April 14, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-22. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 23-27 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Soled et al.

Art Unit: 1725

Soled et al. (US 6,162,350) discloses a catalyst composition useful in hydrocarbon conversion process. The catalyst composition has the formula $(\text{NH}_4)_a(\text{Ni})_b(\text{Mo})_c(\text{W})_d\text{O}_z$ (column 2, lines 19-22), which meets the definition of a cationic layered material set forth in the instant specification. It is taught that the catalyst composition may be combined with an aluminum oxide binder in an amount of 0.5-75% by weight (column 14, lines 1-25). It is further taught that the catalyst composition may be combined with an additive such as rhenium, ruthenium, rhodium, iridium, chromium, vanadium, iron, cobalt, platinum, palladium, cobalt, nickel, molybdenum, or tungsten (column 16, lines 50-62).

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Soled et al.

9. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stamires et al.

Stamires et al. (US 6,716,785) discloses a catalyst composition useful in hydrocarbon conversion processes. The catalyst composition comprises a cationic clay (described in the instant specification as synonymous with a cationic layered material) and a binder matrix material (column 1, lines 65-68). It is taught that the binder/matrix material is boehmite in an amount in the range of 5-95 wt% of the composite (column 12, claim 41). It is taught that the composition may be combined with additives, including rare earth metals, Group VIII metals, noble metals, alkaline earth metals, and transition metals such as Mn, Fe, Ti, W, V, Zr, Cu, Co, Ni, Zn, Mo, and Sn (column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 25).

Art Unit: 1725

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Stamires et al.

10. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Soled et al.

Soled et al. (US 6,156,695) discloses a catalyst composition useful in hydrocarbon conversion processes. The catalyst composition has the formula $(\text{NH}_4)_a(\text{Ni})_b(\text{Mo})_c(\text{W})_d\text{O}_z$ (column 1, lines 65-66), which meets the definition of a cationic layered material set forth in the instant specification. It is noted that the instant specification identifies Soled et al. as teaching a cationic layered material.

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Soled et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1725

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over either of Soled et al. '350 or Soled et al. '695.

Soled et al. '350 and Soled et al. '695 (discussed above) disclose cationic layered materials.

The disclosed product and the instantly claimed product appear to be essentially the same, comprised of the same components, and used in the same manner. In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 21-22 as opposed to the product taught by the prior art, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Also, when the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct and not the examiner to show the same process of making. *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324.

14. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stamires et al.

Art Unit: 1725

Stamires et al. (discussed above) disclose cationic layered materials.

The disclosed product and the instantly claimed product appear to be essentially the same, comprised of the same components, and used in the same manner. In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 21-22 as opposed to the product taught by the prior art, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Also, when the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct and not the examiner to show the same process of making. *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324.

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claims 10-20 are allowed.

16. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not teach a process for the preparation of a cationic layered material comprising step (a) in combination with step (d).

Art Unit: 1725


Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christina Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1176. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5, with Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Christina Johnson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1725

4/18/05

CAJ
April 18, 2005